UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

ANDREW CORZO, SIA HENRY, ALEXANDER LEO-GUERRA, MICHAEL MAERLENDER, BRANDON PIYEVSKY, BENJAMIN SHUMATE, BRITTANY TATIANA WEAVER, and CAMERON WILLIAMS, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BROWN UNIVERSITY, CALIFORNIA
INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, UNIVERSITY
OF CHICAGO, THE TRUSTEES OF COLUMBIA
UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
CORNELL UNIVERSITY, TRUSTEES OF
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE, DUKE UNIVERSITY,
EMORY UNIVERSITY, GEORGETOWN
UNIVERSITY, THE JOHNS HOPKINS
UNIVERSITY, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE
OF TECHNOLOGY, NORTHWESTERN
UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME
DU LAC, THE TRUSTEES OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, WILLIAM
MARSH RICE UNIVERSITY, VANDERBILT
UNIVERSITY, and YALE UNIVERSITY,

Defendants.

Case No.: 1:22-cv-00125

Hon. Matthew F. Kennelly

PLAINTIFFS' STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH LOCAL RULE 37.2

This Local Rule 37.2 Statement accompanies Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Production of Documents Responsive to Plaintiffs' First and Second Sets, and Certain Documents Responsive to Plaintiffs' Third Set, of Requests for Production of Documents ("RFPs"). Plaintiffs have conferred in good faith with Defendants in an effort to resolve the issues raised by this motion.

The parties conducted (a) six global Meet and Confer ("M&C") sessions with all Defendants via video and/or telephone, on November 4, 11, 16, 18, 28, and 30, 2022 concerning

Plaintiffs First and Second Sets of RFPs, and (b) numerous email communications and individual M&C sessions via video and/or telephone, relating to the RFPs.¹

The parties further engaged in a series of M&Cs via video and/or telephone regarding search terms related to those RFPs on November 28, 2022, and January 20, February 3 and 9, 2023, as well as exchanges of emailed proposals, resulting in the parties coming to a global consensus as to search terms in February 2023.² The search terms that have been negotiated include terms covering the RFPs for which all or many Defendants initially took the position that they would not produce documents. Thus, Plaintiffs proceeded with the understanding that Defendants were not standing on their original, broader refusals to produce documents in response to the RFPs.

As part of the above, the parties engaged in numerous M&Cs to discuss the relevance and scope of Plaintiffs' requests. A key result of these M&Cs was that the parties have reached agreement on the temporal scope of what Defendants will produce, to the extent documents and data exist and are reasonably accessible.³ Further production of post-complaint discovery has been resolved by the Court's March 8, 2023 Order (Dkt. 330). In light of, and subject to, these

¹ For virtually every individual Defendant, there have been at least three such M&Cs.

² As noted hereinafter, two Defendants, Emory and Dartmouth, identified individualized circumstances regarding the search terms, which have been resolved. For convenience, Plaintiffs will utilize the abbreviated name for each Defendant used in the Second Amended Complaint, except that the "University of Notre Dame du Lac" will be abbreviated as "ND" and "Johns Hopkins University" will be abbreviated as "JHU".

³ Caltech stated that it was "assessing" the burden of producing pre-January 1, 2017 documents related to the formation, development, and purposes of the 568 Presidents' Group and the Consensus Methodology. As for JHU, during a February 7, 2023, meet and confer, Samer Musallam, Esq. took the position that JHU will not search for or produce any unstructured data and documents from more than a few years before JHU joined the 568 Group. Mr. Musallam informed Plaintiffs that they would have to seek relief from the Court for any data or documents going back further in time.

agreements on scope, Plaintiffs understood all Defendants to have agreed to search for and produce documents the production of which had been stated to be subject to M&Cs, particularly regarding the scope of the RFP.

In a February 1, 2023 email following up on an original January 29, 2023 email,

Plaintiffs invited each individual Defendant to advise Plaintiffs if, due to that Defendant's

"exceptional individualized circumstances," that individual Defendant had a particular issue with
the global resolutions that had been reached. In response, no Defendants brought to Plaintiffs'
attention such individualized objections that would warrant a failure to produce documents. Two
Defendants (Emory; Dartmouth) raised individualized concerns regarding the breadth of
documents returned by certain searches based on the otherwise agreed-upon search terms. Emory
raised an issue regarding one search string to which Plaintiffs acceded. Plaintiffs conditionally
accepted Dartmouth's revisions pending a review of their productions.⁴

On February 28, 2023, Plaintiffs forwarded to Defendants a detailed 4-page email, with attached itemized Schedules (Exhibit 1 hereto), concerning the RFPs stating that, in light of the above and following the extensive dialogue between the parties over numerous M&Cs and the resolution of search terms and scope of production, and further rulings and other guidance from the Court, Plaintiffs understand that all Defendants will now use the agreed upon search terms and produce responsive documents to all of Plaintiffs' remaining active RFPs, unless Plaintiffs are specifically advised to the contrary by close of business on March 2, 2023. Plaintiffs further sought written confirmation from each Defendant by close of business on March 2, 2023, that the

⁴ A third Defendant had initially raised an issue, but later withdrew their issue.

Defendant intends to search for and produce documents responsive to the remaining active RFPs

from Plaintiffs' First and Second Sets of RFPs. Plaintiffs further requested that if any Defendant

intended to stand on its objection in response to any RFPs, the Defendant advise Plaintiffs in

writing by close of business on March 2, 2023, as to which RFPs it refuses to produce responsive

documents, and its grounds for doing so.⁵

Plaintiffs' February 28, 2023 email stated that: (a) plaintiffs were further willing to

engage in a further M&C to resolve any remaining uncertainty that may exist, unless in

Plaintiffs' judgment the issue or RFP is ripe for presentation to the Court; and (b) in the absence

of confirmation that Defendants are producing documents notwithstanding earlier objections, and

substantial productions on March 3 and March 6, 2023 are consistent with this confirmation,

Plaintiffs will then be forced to move the Court to compel production.

Defendants' response to Plaintiffs' February 28 email and schedules was a dismissive one

paragraph email from Sarah F. Kirkpatrick, Esq. (Exhibit 2 hereto) wherein Defendants provided

no detailed response and suggested that Plaintiffs' return to further individual M&Cs with the 17

Defendants.

Plaintiffs respectfully submit that they have complied with Local Rule 37.2 as to the

issues that are addressed in the accompanying Motion.

Dated: March 21, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

By:/s/ Edward J. Normand

Devin "Vel" Freedman

/s/ Robert D. Gilbert

Robert D. Gilbert

⁵ This email did not address the Third Set of RFPs, to which Defendants had only responded the night

before.

4

Edward J. Normand
Peter Bach-y-Rita
FREEDMAN NORMAND
FRIEDLAND LLP
99 Park Avenue
Suite 1910
New York, NY 10016
Tel: 646-970-7513
vel@fnf.law
tnormand@fnf.law
pbachyrita@fnf.law

Eric L. Cramer
Caitlin G. Coslett
BERGER MONTAGUE PC
1818 Market Street, Suite 3600
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Tel: 215-875-3000
ecramer@bm.net
ccoslett@bm.net

Daniel J. Walker
Robert E. Litan
Hope Brinn
BERGER MONTAGUE PC
2001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006
Tel: 202-559-9745
rlitan@bm.net
dwalker@bm.net
hbrinn@bm.net

Counsel for Plaintiffs

Elpidio Villarreal Robert S. Raymar* Sarah Schuster Alexis Marquez Steven Magnusson GILBERT LITIGATORS & COUNSELORS, P.C. 11 Broadway, Suite 615 New York, NY 10004 Phone: (646) 448-5269 rgilbert@gilbertlitigators.com pdvillarreal@gilbertlitigators.com rraymar@gilbertlitigators.com sschuster@gilbertlitigators.com amarquez@gilbertlitigators.com smagnusson@gilbertlitigators.com

^{*} Pro hac vice